## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Diamond Warren, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Paul Penzone, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-22-02200-PHX-DWL (CDB)

## **ORDER**

This civil action has been referred to Magistrate Judge Bibles for all pretrial proceedings. (Doc. 4.) On April 21, 2023, Defendants Bulldis, Moses, and Perez (together, "the County Officer Defendants") filed a motion for a restraining order that would prevent "all counsel, parties, and their representatives" from making certain extrajudicial statements. (Doc. 56.) The motion is now fully briefed. (Docs. 69, 70.)

On June 12, 2023, Judge Bibles issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") concluding that the request for a restraining order should be denied. (Doc. 73.) The R&R further provided that "the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of a copy of this recommendation within which to file specific written objections with the Court." (*Id.* at 18.)

Here, no such objections have been filed and the time to object has expired. Thus, the Court accepts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. *See, e.g., Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985) ("It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard,

when neither party objects to those findings."); *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) ("[N]o review is required of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation unless objections are filed."). *See also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) ("[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise.").

Accordingly,

## IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. The R&R (Doc. 73) is **adopted**.
- 2. The motion for a restraining order (Doc. 56) is **denied**.

Dated this 27th day of June, 2023.

Dominic W. Lanza United States District Judge